



IFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant.

Roni ZVULONI

Serial No.: 10/542,386

Filed: November 30, 2005

For: **Device, System, And Method For
Detecting And Localizing
Obstruction Within A Blood Vessel**

Examiner: Helena Bor

ପ୍ରକାଶିତ ମହିନେ

Group Art Unit: 3768

Attorney Docket: 30241

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Sir:

This submission is being made to summarize the telephonic interview held on October 30, 2007. Participants in the interview were Examiners Bor and Whittaker, with Martin Moynihan, Maier Fenster and Paul Kleinberger representing the Applicant.

On October 11, 2007 Applicant filed a response to an Office Action mailed on May 7, 2007. A telephone interview was requested for the purpose of further explaining the differences seen to exist between the pending claims of the above-mentioned application and the prior art Knowlton reference 6,427,089 cited by the Examiner.

Applicant pointed out that Knowlton's primary reference is to the use of strain gauges as sensors detecting contact between a balloon and tissues surrounding the balloon, and that consequently such strain gauges are mounted to detect pressure perpendicular to the surface of the balloon. Knowlton's sensors are necessarily designed and mounted in such a way as to be largely independent of influence by changes in strain along the surface of the balloon, which strains would otherwise

interfere with the measurement of strain imposed by contact between the balloon and the stomach wall, which was Knowlton's purpose for using them.

Applicant pointed out that the claims under examination specify strain gauges each operable to report a degree of expansion of a local portion of a wall of said expandable balloon, which is precisely what Knowlton's strain gauges must not do if they are to serve his purpose.

The Examiners suggested amending the claims so as to make explicit that the strain gauges are mounted on the balloon in such a way as to measure strain along the surface of the balloon. Applicants agreed to so amend the claims if required to do so by the Examiner, but requested allowance of the unamended claims, pointing out that such mounting of the strain gauges is implicit in the un-amended language of the claim, in that only if the gauges are so mounted could they be "operable to report a degree of expansion of a local portion of a wall of said expandable balloon."

The participants also discussed Knowlton's secondary reference to strain gauges for use in manometric measurement. The Applicant pointed out that the references at Column 14, lines 4-24 of Knowlton are directed to measurements of the (necessarily uniform) pressures *within* the balloon, pressures imposed on the balloon contents by pressure of the stomach wall on the balloon surface. Applicant pointed out that these measurements are also different from, and incompatible with, measurement of expansion of local portions of the balloon wall, as set forth in the claims.

An early allowance of the pending claims of the present application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Martin D. Moynihan
Registration No. 40,338

Date: November 8, 2007